

I am not advised as to what the Committee on Rules will do.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, the reason, Mr. Leader, I asked that question because of the very high respect I have for the gentleman's influence with that committee; and I thought, therefore, the gentleman might have some inkling as to what might be done. I say that somewhat jokingly, but I really do believe that if we are going to take the bill that the Senate sends over, bring it directly to the floor without committee consideration, that not only in a sense of fairness but in a sense of getting the input of the 125 to 130 million people that this side of the aisle represents, that we give us the opportunity to offer such amendments as we think to be appropriate with respect to that legislation.

Mr. Leader, with respect to the continuity of Congress, this has been an issue we tried to deal with in the past. It is a very important issue with which we should deal. I know at times I have talked to the gentleman and the Speaker and particularly to my friend, the majority whip, with reference to having a bipartisan proposal so that both parties, on an issue of great magnitude to this institution in terms of continuity and how do we form a majority to take action, has this been to the gentleman's knowledge, and I do not have that knowledge. I have not talked to anybody on the Committee on Rules or any other committee out of which this might have come. Does the gentleman know whether or not we have bipartisan agreement with respect to the legislation the gentleman intends to put on the floor next week?

Mr. DELAY. I thank the gentleman for yielding. There are ongoing discussions about this bill with the minority and particularly with the minority leader's office. We are continuing those discussions.

I remind the gentleman that this bill got 306 votes last year. I think that is pretty bipartisan.

□ 1445

So as we work through this, we will continue to discuss and work with the minority to make it even more bipartisan than it is.

Mr. HOYER. I appreciate that.

And reclaiming my time, Mr. Leader, I understand what you are saying in terms of the number of folks who voted for it. There were a very substantial number who voted for it.

This is not a partisan issue. It should not be a partisan issue. This is a practical judgment as to how constitutionally and appropriately within the framework of our democracy and representation that we frame or have legislation framed so that does reflect the interests of our democracy as well as the interest of ensuring continuity.

From that perspective of not just having a number of votes for it, but

having the leadership on both sides, I do not mean necessarily the gentleman from California (Ms. PELOSI) and myself, but the committee leadership on both sides, whether it is the Committee on Rules, Committee on the Judiciary or any other committee that might consider it somewhat in agreement.

Mr. DELAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to my friend.

Mr. DELAY. I hope the gentleman is not raising a standard that is even higher than given to the Constitution, in that when two-thirds of this House has voted for a measure, in order for it to be bipartisan, we have to go even higher than two-thirds of the House.

We are continuing to work with the minority leader. We understand her concerns and your concerns. But when you have well over two-thirds of the House voting for a bill, it gets more and more difficult to write a bill that requires unanimity.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, no one is suggesting unanimity. I understand that. We are suggesting, though, that we work together on this issue. And the mere fact that we have the ability to get a large number of votes for a bill is critically important. Your observation is correct in terms of numbers necessary to pass the constitutional amendment or to pass other legislation by two-thirds. It is obviously important.

But it is equally important, it seems to me, and might facilitate passage of this through the entire Congress, not just through the House of Representatives, to have input from the leadership of both parties to try to come to grips with what I perceive not to be a partisan issue, but a difficult issue on which constitutional scholars have differed as to how we can do this, on which Members of this House on both sides of the aisle have differed.

But we do not need to pursue it. I understand the gentleman's point. But I would hope that we could have significant discussions about this and hopefully come to agreement of the minds. Mr. Leader, we are not going to have a scheduling colloquy next week because it will be the Presidents' Day recess. But can you indicate what we may have on the floor the week that we return from the Presidents' Day recess?

Mr. DELAY. Frankly, I do not know. We will just have to get back to you on that.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Leader, thank you for that.

I understand we may receive the President's tsunami supplemental appropriations next week. Do you anticipate we may also receive the Iraq-Afghanistan supplemental request as well?

Mr. DELAY. If the gentleman would yield.

Mr. HOYER. Yield to my friend.

Mr. DELAY. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. The White House has indicated to us that they will submit, as the gentleman said, the supplemental request on the tsunami next week. But we also expect the supplemental requests on the war on terror, and I would expect the House to consider some supplemental sometime in the month of March.

Mr. HOYER. Thank you for that. And you answered my second question. The energy bill you had brought up in our previous colloquy, can you tell us where that might stand at this point this time?

Mr. DELAY. If the gentleman would yield.

Mr. HOYER. Yield to my friend.

Mr. DELAY. The energy bill, we are continuing to work on that bill, just working on putting it together in order to introduce it. It is not ready, and I do not know, frankly, when it will be ready to even introduce, much less think about committee action and when the House might consider it.

Mr. HOYER. It would be fair to assume, then, that certainly it is not going to be in the next 2 or 3 weeks?

Yield to my friend.

Mr. DELAY. If the gentleman would yield, I think that is fair to assume.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 2005 AND HOUR OF MEETING ON TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 2005

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon at Monday next; and further, when the House adjourns on that day it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, February 15, 2005 for morning hour debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 310, BROADCAST DE-CENCY ENFORCEMENT ACT 2005

(Mr. BISHOP of Utah asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of making an announcement.

The Committee on Rules may meet the week of February 14 to grant a rule which could limit the amendment process for floor consideration of H.R. 310, the Broadcast Decency Enforcement Act of 2005. Any Member wishing to offer an amendment should submit 55 copies of the amendment and one copy of a brief explanation of the amendment to the Committee on Rules in room H-312 of the Capitol by 12 noon on Tuesday, February 15, 2005.

Members should draft their amendments to the bill as reported by the Committee on Energy and Commerce on February 9, 2005, which is expected to be filed on Monday, February 14. Members are also advised that the text should be available for their review on the Web site of the Committee on Energy and Commerce and the Committee on Rules by Friday, February 11, 2005. Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments are drafted in the most appropriate form and should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain that their amendments comply with the rules of the House.

SOCIAL SECURITY SYSTEM

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we have heard the President over the last 3 or 4 days present to the American people the idea of the crisis nature of revising, reforming, or altering completely the Social Security system. I go home and look forward to holding one of the first town hall meetings with my constituents to really lay out how we can work in a bipartisan manner and save Social Security.

It is important for the American people to realize that \$1.5 trillion will be needed to take away from Social Security to establish what one would call "private accounts," private accounts that could be separate and apart from Social Security. Many Americans do not realize it is not just a retirement benefit, it is a survivor benefit. It helps children of those who are deceased.

More importantly, we forged a bipartisan response to Social Security in 1983 with Tip O'Neill and Ronald Reagan that caused this to be solvent for at least 60 years.

This proposal will not only undermine, but it will destroy Social Security as we know it. Does it need reforming and fixing? Absolutely, and we can do that with a number of suggestions, but the plan that has now been proposed by the administration is one that will undermine and eliminate Social Security.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOUSTANY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

WHY WE NEED THE OMNIBUS NON-PROLIFERATION AND ANTI-NUCLEAR TERRORISM ACT OF 2005

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, this morning the North Korean Government acknowledged publicly for the first time that it has nuclear weapons. In a statement issued by the North Korean Foreign Ministry, Pyongyang also said that it will boycott the six-party talks designed to end its nuclear program.

North Korea's surprising declaration has again reminded us of the most pressing national security challenge that we face: the proliferation of nuclear weapons and the possibility that a terrorist group will acquire a nuclear bomb and use it against the United States.

Earlier this week, my colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) and I introduced the Omnibus Nuclear Nonproliferation and Anti-Nuclear Terrorism Act of 2005 to better enable the United States to prevent what Graham Allison of Harvard University has termed "the ultimate preventable catastrophe." I am pleased that we were joined as original cosponsors by 11 of our colleagues.

Over the past several months, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) and I have consulted with a range of experts to produce a set of policies that we believe will be effective and which can be implemented quickly. Our bill will do the following:

It creates an Office of Nonproliferation Programs in the White House to centralize budgetary and policy authority. Since nonproliferation programs are spread across the U.S. Government, it makes sense to have one office overseeing all of it, signing off on budgets and developing a coordinated strategy.

The bill enhances the Cooperative Threat Reduction, CTR, program by streamlining and accelerating Nunn-Lugar implementation and granting more flexibility to the President and the Secretary of Defense to undertake nonproliferation projects outside the former Soviet Union. Our bill does this by removing conditions on Nunn-Lugar assistance that in the past have forced the suspension of time-sensitive efforts.

In 2002, President Bush was unable for the first time to certify that Russia had met all of its program-wide conditions, resulting in a halt to all CTR

funding until he was able to obtain and use authority to waive the certification requirement in early 2003.

The conditions have also provided CTR opponents within Russia with an excuse to blame the United States for delays caused by a lack of access and transparency on the part of Moscow.

We also ask for the President, in our bill, to catalog impediments to renegotiation of the CTR umbrella agreement and other bilateral programs with Russia. The hope is that by identifying them all, the Congress and the administration can better solve them quickly.

The bill asks the President to address the issue of unresolved liability protections for U.S. firms doing nonproliferation work in Russia.

This bill will enhance the Global Threat Reduction Initiative, announced by former Secretary Abraham last May, to accelerate the global clean-out of the most vulnerable stockpiles of nuclear material. At its current pace, it will take more than a decade to clean up the most vulnerable nuclear sites around the globe.

The bill also urges the President to expand the Proliferation Security Initiative beyond its current members and to engage the U.N. Security Council to provide the specific legal authority to interdict WMD material. It also provides funding for training and exercise with our PSI partners, especially the new members.

At present there are no international standards regarding the securing of nuclear weapons. The Schiff-Shays bill urges the President to develop a set of internationally recognized standards and to work with other nations and the IAEA to get such standards adopted and implemented.

Russia's tactical nuclear arsenal is considered the most likely place from which a nuclear weapon would be stolen and sold or given to terrorists. The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) and I authorize U.S. assistance to Russia to conduct an inventory of tactical and nonsecured weapons. Our bill also requires the DOD to support a report on past U.S. efforts to help Russia account for and secure its tactical and nonsecured nukes and to recommend ways to improve such efforts.

We also deal with the problem of scientists in the former Soviet Union and work to prevent them from selling their services to North Korea, Iran and al Qaeda.

We also encourage the President to deal with the problem of the NPT's loophole that allows nations like Iran to pursue nuclear weapons through the guise of a nuclear energy program. Our bill asks the President to submit a report outlining strategies to better control fuel cycle technologies and possible ways to close the loophole in Article IV without undermining the overall integrity of the treaty.